

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. 1.111 filed September 22, 2004  
Serial No. 09/777,010  
Attorney Docket No. 010122

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 8 remain pending in this application. The objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully traversed below.

#### **The Abstract**

The Abstract has been replaced with a corrected Abstract above to overcome the various formalities identified in the Office Action.

#### **The Drawings**

The Office Action objected to Figures 7 and 12 for containing minor errors. Formal corrected replacement drawings are attached.

#### **The Specification**

The specification was amended to correct the minor typographical errors identified in the Office Action.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claim 7 was amended to correct a minor typographical error.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1 – 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over **de Hond** (USP 6,002,853) in view of **Towell** (USP 6,647,411).

The Office action relied upon **de Hond** for allegedly disclosing the handling of summary information for pull type information, searching and displaying resulting summaries matching the search criteria. The Office Action stated that “**de Hond** does not explicitly teach a push type interface for the reception and extraction of summaries.” For this missing feature of **de Hond**, the Office Action makes the further reference to **Towell** for disclosing a push type information interface, as well as extracting and displaying summaries of the push type information.

It is submitted that **de Hond** and **Towell** do not disclose the present claimed elements in the manner described in the Office Action. In addition, the present claimed invention is still not achieved even if **de Hond** and **Towell** were combined.

A fundamental error in the rejection is the lack of “summaries described in a predetermined common format.” With regard to **de Hond**, the Office Action alleged that its “virtual reality scene constitutes a summary.” On the other hand, with regard to **Towell**, the Office Action stated “the user’s viewing of the on-demand information from the push type transmission constitutes the extraction of summaries or information from a push type source.” These statements indicate that **de Hond** and **Towell** do *not* disclose “summaries described in a predetermined *common* format.” The virtual reality scenes of **de Hond** and the on-demand information from push type transmissions of **Towell** do not constitute summaries described in a

predetermined common format. These are different types of information that do not have a common format.

Indeed, nothing in the cited prior art addresses the handling of information from various sources (e.g. pull type and push type) that have different formats. The present invention is capable of dealing with information provided in different data formats from a plurality of different media for display on a single viewer. Independent claim 1 recites summaries of both the pull type information, as well as summaries of the push type information, as having a predetermined common format. Such features, in combination with other claimed elements, allow the present invention to be capable of handling information provided in various formats for display on a single viewer. Nothing in the cited prior art teaches or suggests such features. For at least these reasons, the present claimed invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Moreover, the Applicant disagrees with the assertion in the Office Action that “a summary storage means for storing said extracted summaries (Figure 2; column 6, lines 39-45, where the database information, namely the summaries, is stored in the memory. This is also inherent by the nature of **de Hond**’s inventions)”. It is submitted that **de Hond** does not teach “summaries”. The database 52 in Figure 2 of **de Hond** contains a predetermined amount of basic information (e.g.; business name, address, phone number) for each included business (column 6, lines 46-49). The basic information is completely different from “summaries” in the present invention. In other words, the basic information disclosed in **de Hond** is not included in the “summaries”. For at least these further reasons, the present claimed invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. 1.111 filed September 22, 2004  
Serial No. 09/777,010  
Attorney Docket No. 010122

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



John P. Kong  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 40,054

1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111  
JPK/kal/jnj